



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/923,730	08/07/2001	Takeshi Kobayashi	201440-9001	1108

7590 06/20/2006
Laff, Whitesel & Saret, Ltd.
401 North Michigan Avenue, Suite 1700
Chicago, IL 60611

EXAMINER

ELAHEE, MD S

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2614

DATE MAILED: 06/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<p align="center">Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</p>	Application No. 09/923,730	Applicant(s) KOBAYASHI, TAKESHI	
	Examiner Md S. Elahee	Art Unit 2614	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 11 May 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☐ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
 5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
 6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
 7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
 The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
 Claim(s) allowed: _____.
 Claim(s) objected to: _____.
 Claim(s) rejected: 1-11.
 Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
 9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
 12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
 13. ☐ Other: _____.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Regarding independent claims, the applicant argues on page 4, that Gorzel didn't teach that conductive surface is a ground plane. Examiner respectfully disagrees with this argument. Since applicant didn't claim ground plane and is silent about the functionality of claimed "ground pattern" examiner interprets item 11 of fig.1 as "ground pattern".

The applicant further argues on page 4, that Gorzel does not teach a reflector that refers to a parasitic element that is driven solely by electromagnetic coupling with the driven element of the antenna. Examiner agrees with this argument. However, the applicant didn't claim the limitation.

The applicant further argues on pages 4, 5, that Gorzel's "antenna terminal" is not the claimed "internal antenna". Examiner respectfully disagrees with this argument. The applicant is silent for the feature of the claimed "internal antenna" that can distinguish it from the Gorzel's "antenna terminal".

The applicant further argues on page 5, that Gorzel does not teach a reflector is connected with the ground plane. Examiner respectfully disagrees with this argument. The applicant didn't claim "the ground plane".


The applicant further argues on page 5, that examiner does not identify feeding point on the PCB and fig.1 of Gorzel clearly shows that antenna metal element F3 does not connect with element 30 [i.e., internal antenna] as well as F3 cannot be brought into contact with a feeding point on the PCB. Examiner respectfully disagrees with this argument. Examiner interprets item 17 of fig.2 as feeding terminal. F3 is coupled to item 17 (fig.2; col.3, lines 45-47) and element 30 is connected to item 17 (fig.2); therefore, it is clear that F3 connects element 30 through item 17. The applicant didn't claim "a feeding point on the PCB". Examiner further interprets feeding point is one of connections between feeding terminal and other elements connected or coupled to it. Thus it is clear that F3 cannot be brought into contact with a feeding point.

The applicant further argues on page 5, it is not inherent for Gorzel that the space for the internal antenna for a telephone housing. Examiner respectfully disagrees with this argument. Gorzel teaches that the entire antenna can be located within the housing of the cordless telephone (col.2, lines 3-5) and internal antenna is an element of that entire antenna. Therefore, the housing must have the space to accommodate the internal antenna if the internal antenna is located within the housing of the telephone.

Therefore, the rejection of the claims in view of Gorzel will remain.



**ALAM ELAHEE
PATENT EXAMINER**



**FAN TSANG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600**